32S3 Application Scoring Rubric and Criteria - Updated for 2024 Application Process **10/18/24**

Areas 1 through 6 are scored based on the rating scale provided for each area. A total score will range from 0 – 21. Typically, competitive proposals have a score of 14 and above.

Area 1: Project Goals/ Scope

3: High	*2: Medium*	*1: Low*	*0: Unacceptable*
Project description, including how the project is situated within the disciplinary context, is easily understood by a non specialist reader and clearly articulates why the project is significant or of interest.	Project description, including how the project is situated within the disciplinary context, is reasonably clear to a non-specialist reader and articulates why the project is significant or of interest.	Project description, including how the project is situated within the disciplinary context, is not easily understood by a non-specialist reader, or it is not easily understood why the project is significant or of interest.	Project description, including how the project is situated within the disciplinary context, is unclear to a non-specialist reader, or it is unclear why the project is significant or of interest.

Area 2: Student Preparation and Motivation

4: Exceptional	*3: High*	*2: Medium*	*1: Low*	*0: Unacceptable*
This section is student driven and demonstrates a clear understanding of the project goals, methodologies, and nature of their contribution; they are highly qualified to pursue the project; they present compelling and clearly articulated learning goals, and how this experience will aid in achieving their professional and academic goals.	The student statement reflects a good understanding of project goals, methodologies, and nature of their contribution; the student demonstrates that they are highly qualified to pursue the project; their statement clearly articulates their learning goals, and how this experience will aid in achieving their professional and academic goals.	The student statement reflects an adequate understanding of project goals, methodologies, and/or nature of their contribution; they demonstrate that they are qualified to pursue the project; the student statement articulates their learning goals or how this experience will aid in achieving their professional and academic goals.	The student statement reflects a limited understanding of project goals, methodologies, and/or nature of their contribution; there are concerns about the student qualifications for the project; the student statement inadequately describes their learning goals or how this experience will aid in achieving their professional and academic goals.	The student statement reflects an insufficient understanding of project goals, methodologies, and/or nature of their contribution; the student does not demonstrate that they are qualified to pursue the project; the student statement does not articulate learning goals or how this experience will aid in achieving professional and academic goals

Area 3: Mentorship/ Apprenticeship Plan

4: Exceptional	3: High	*2: Medium*	*1: Low*	*0: Unacceptable*
Goals and mentoring approach are clearly described, explained, and tailored to the student applicant; the student and faculty member have intentionally begun preparation for this project, and this has been clearly described; project is exceptionally appropriate for collaboration with this undergraduate student; the plan for active collaboration and transition to independence with this student is clearly described and thoughtfully crafted.	Goals and mentoring approach are clearly described and explained; the student and faculty member have intentionally begun preparation for this project; project is appropriate for collaboration with this undergraduate student; the plan for active collaboration and transition to independence with this student is clearly described.	Goals and mentoring approach are adequately described; the student and faculty member have begun preparation for this project; project is appropriate for collaboration with an undergraduate student; a plan for collaboration and/or transition to independence with a student is described.	Goals and/or mentoring approach are not adequately described; insufficient details on how the student and faculty member have begun preparation for this project; not clear if this project is appropriate for collaboration with an undergraduate student; a plan for collaboration and/or transition to independence with a student is not sufficiently described.	Goals and/or mentoring approach are missing; unclear if student and faculty member have begun preparation for this project; project is not suited for collaboration with an undergraduate student; a plan for collaboration and/or transition to independence with a student is not provided.

Area 4: Project Feasibility

4: Exceptional	*3: High*	*2: Medium*	*1: Low*	*0: Unacceptable*
There is a clear description of how the goals and aims will advance the student's understanding of the scholarly process. The tasks of the student and faculty describe a collaborative process but are clearly delineated. The faculty member has demonstrated content/methodological expertise; a careful, detailed consideration of the timeline, budget, and other resources necessary for completion of the project was included.	Goals and aims of the project are clearly explained and feasible within the given timeline; the tasks of the student and faculty are clearly described; the faculty member has demonstrated content/methodological expertise; there is evidence of careful, detailed consideration of the timeline, budget, and other resources necessary for completion of the project.	Goals and aims of the project are adequately stated; the tasks of the student and faculty are adequately described; the faculty member has sufficient content/ methodological expertise; a proposed timeline is provided; there is evidence of reasonable consideration of the budgetary and other resources necessary for completion of the project.	Goals and aims of the project are unclear and/or vague; the tasks of the student and faculty are not sufficiently described; the faculty member has not demonstrated content/ methodological expertise; the proposed timeline is unclear and/or vague; there is minimal evidence of consideration of the budgetary and other resources necessary for completion of the project.	Goals and aims of the project are not present; the tasks of the student and faculty are not described; the faculty member did not address content/methodological expertise; the proposed timeline is not feasible given the timeline, or not present; there is no evidence of consideration of the budgetary and other resources necessary for completion of the project.

Area 5: Commitment to Project

3: High	*2: Medium*	*1: Low*	*0: Unacceptable*
Both student and faculty member detail and describe their summer obligations and approach to balancing these, in a way that clearly prioritizes the S3 project.	Both student and faculty member describe their summer obligations and appear to prioritize the S3 project.	Both student and faculty member describe their summer obligations but the S3 project is not clearly prioritized.	Neither the student nor faculty member detail or describe their summer obligations and the S3 project is not prioritized.

Area 6: Dissemination Plan

3: High	*2: Medium*	*1: Low*	*0: Unacceptable*
Plans for disseminating the outcomes of the project **beyond** the required events (S3 Showcase and SSD) are described. The plan describes why the proposed venues were selected and how the venues support the scholar's development and learning.	Plans for disseminating the outcomes of the project **beyond** the required events (S3 Showcase and SSD) are described. But the description does not include why the venues were selected and how they support the scholar's development and learning.	Plans for disseminating the outcomes of the project only describe the required events (S3 Showcase and SSD).	No plan for dissemination is proposed.